APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/486,759	06/08/2000	ALBHY GALUTEN	9389/1F215-U	4604

7590   09/29/2003

DARBY & DARBY
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-7513

EXAMINER
MAUNG, ZARNI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 July 2003* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *8* .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1.   Claims 1 – 28 are pending. Claims 16, 17, and 19 were amended in the paper

filed July 3, 2003 (Paper No. 10.) Claims 21 – 28 were added in Paper No. 10.

2.   The declaration filed on July 3, 2003 (Paper No. 9) under 37 CFR 1.131 is

sufficient to overcome the Bayrakeri and Borella references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4.   Claims 21 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

5.   Claims 21 and 26 recite the limitation "the content" in lines 3 and 2, respectively.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

6.   Claim 25 recites the limitation "the user" in line 2. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8.   Claims 1 – 4, 6, 7, and 9 - 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by International Business Machines Corporation, European Patent

Application Pub. No. EP 0471639 A2 (hereinafter referred to as IBM.)

9.   As to claim 1, IBM teaches the invention as claimed, including generating a

handle at a first location where the handle identifies a media object (col. 2, lines 37 –

41); transmitting the handle from the first location to a second location through the

network (col. 2, lines 48 – 50); and rendering the identified media object at the second

location in accordance with the handle (col. 3, lines 3 – 4.)

10.   As to claim 9, IBM teaches rendering a media object at a first location (col. 3,

lines 47 – 48); generating a handle at the first location where the handle identifies the

media object and identifies at least one value-chain participant (col. 2, lines 37 – 41;

inherent in col. 5, lines 39 – 43: in order to notify the user the reference must identify

the user); transmitting the handle to at least one second location over the network; and

rendering the media object at the second location using the handle (col. 1, line 59 – col.

2, line 20.)

11.   As to claim 2, IBM teaches obtaining an identifier for the media object (col. 2, line

40); obtaining an identifier for each participant in a value-chain for the media object

(inherent in col. 5, lines 39 – 43); and combining the identifiers to form the handle (Fig.

2, reference character 58.)

12.   As to claim 3, IBM teaches that the transmitting step operates to transmit e-mail

or instant messaging (col. 4, line 46.)

13.   As to claims 4 and 11, IBM teaches the steps of transmitting the handle from the

second location to a server (col. 6, lines 17 – 18); at the second location, receiving from

the server the media object identified by the handle (col. 6, lines 27 – 29); optionally,

displaying the media object at the second location when the media object contains a

visual portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding to media object at the

second location when the media object contains an audio portion.

14.   As to claims 6 and 12, IBM teaches that the handle includes an object-id

specifying a location of the media object (col. 2, lines 40 – 41.)

15.   As to claim 7, IBM teaches that the handle includes a set of terms that govern

the rendition of the media object (col. 2, lines 51 – 55.)

16.   As to claim 10, IBM teaches obtaining permission to render the media object at

the second location from the at least one value-chain participant (col. 6, lines 29 – 33);

and rendering the media object at the second location in accordance with such

permission (col. 6, lines 50 - 51.)

17.   Claims 1 and 4 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

the HTML 4.0 Specification (hereinafter referred to as HTML 4.0.)

18.   As to claim 1, HTML 4.0 teaches the invention as claimed, including generating a

handle at a first location where the handle identifies a media object (section 2.2);

transmitting the handle from the first location to a second location through the network

(section 2.2); and rendering the identified media object at the second location in

accordance with the handle (section 13.3.1.)

19.   As to claim 3, HTML 4.0 teaches that the transmitting step transmits e-mail

(section 14.6.)

20.   As to claim 4, HTML 4.0 teaches the steps of transmitting the handle from the

second location to a server; at the second location, receiving from the server the media

object identified by the handle (section 13); optionally, displaying the media object at

the second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally,

producing audio corresponding to media object at the second location when the media

object contains an audio portion (section 13.)

21.   As to claim 5, HTML 4.0 teaches optionally, displaying the media object at the

second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally,

producing audio corresponding to the media object at the second location when the

media object contains an audio portion (section 13.)

22.   As to claim 6, HTML 4.0 teaches an object-id specifying the location of the media

object (section 13.1.)

23.   As to claim 7, HTML 4.0 teaches that the handle includes a set of terms that

govern the rendition of the media object (sections 14.2.2, 13.3.)

24.   As to claim 8, HTML 4.0 teaches that the handle includes a reference to a set of

terms that governs the rendition of the media object (section 14.3.)

25.   Claims 13 - 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by
Mirashrafi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,199,096.

26.   As to claim 13, Mirashrafi teaches the invention as claimed, including generating
a handle at a first location where the handle identifies a media object (col. 4, lines 9 -
10); transmitting the handle from the first location to a second location through the
network (col. 4, lines 21 - 25); and rendering the identified media object at the second
location such that rendition of the media object at the second location is synchronized
with the rendition of the media object at the first location (col. 4, lines 29 – 30.)

27.   As to claim 14, Mirashrafi teaches transmitting the handle from the second
location to a server; at the second location, receiving from the server the media object
identified by the handle); optionally, displaying the media object at the second location
when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio
corresponding to media object at the second location when the media object contains
an audio portion (col. 4, lines 32 - 34.)

28.   As to claims 15, Mirashrafi teaches an object-id specifying a location of the
media object (col. 4, line 12.)

29. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Koppolu et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0103824.

30. As to claim 17, Koppolu teaches the invention as claimed, including generating a

handle at a first location where the handle identifies a media object and a reference to a

technical-support-source (paragraphs 453); transmitting the handle from the first

location to a second location through the network (inherent: the handles are embedded

in web pages which are transmitted from the first location, a server, to the second

location, a client); optionally, displaying the media object at the second location when

the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio

corresponding to the media object at the second location when the media object

contains an audio portion; and establishing access to the technical support source

according to the reference in the handle (paragraph 453.)

31. As to claim 19, Koppolu teaches generating a handle at a first location where the

handle identifies a media object and a reference to a technical-support-source

(paragraphs 453); transmitting the handle from the first location to a second location

through the network (inherent: the handles are embedded in web pages which are

transmitted from the first location, a server, to the second location, a client); transmitting

the handle from the second location to a server on the network; at the second location,

receiving from the server the media object identified by the handle (paragraphs 476,

477); optionally, displaying the media object at the second location when the media object contains a visual portion; and optionally, producing audio corresponding to the media object at the second location when the media object contains an audio portion; and establishing access to the technical support source according to the reference in the handle (paragraph 453.)

32.   Claims 26 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Roberts et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,987,525.

33.   As to claims 26 and 28, Roberts teaches the invention as claimed, including rendering the content at a first location for a first user (col. 7, lines 10 - 11,); searching for a second user rendering similar content (col. 7, lines 14 - 16); notifying the first user of the second user (col. 7, lines 22 - 24); and activating a chat session between the first user and the second user (col. 6, lines 22 - 24.)

34.   As to claim 27, Roberts teaches synchronizing the rendering of the content for the first user with the rendering of the content for the second user (col. 7, lines 29 – 33.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

35.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

36.   Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mirashrafi as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Ogdon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,161,137.

37.   As to claim 16, Mirashafri teaches the invention as claimed with respect to claim 1. However, Mirashafri does not teach computing a transport time as the difference between a current absolute time and an absolute time when the handle was transmitted or at the second location, rendering the media object corresponding a temporal location incremented by the transport time.

38.   Ogdon teaches calculating a transport time (col. 23, lines 6 – 7.)

39.   Although Ogdon does not specifically teach the rendering step, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Ogdon and Mirashafri and further to modify the combination to include a rendering step because Ogdon suggests that the delay may be used as a determining factor in how to treat the content (Ogdon, col. 24, lines 28- 32.)

40.   Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Mirashafri.

41.   As to claims 17 and 19, Mirashafri teaches generating a handle at a first user

location where the handle includes an identifier for a media object (col. 4, lines 9 - 10);

transmitting the handle from the first user location to a second user location through the

network (col. 4, lines 21 - 25); and displaying the media object at the second user

location, for a user, when the media object contains a visual portion; (col. 4, lines 29 –

30); producing audio corresponding to the media object at the second user location, for

the user, when the media object contains an audio portion (col. 4, lines 29 – 30.)

However, Mirashafri fails to teach that the handle includes a reference to a technical-

support source or the step of establishing access to the technical-support source

according to the reference in the handle.

42.   Nevertheless, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

modify the teachings of Mirashafri to include technical support sources because

Mirashafri suggests the use of the system for technical support (col. 12, lines 55 – 56.)

43.   Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Mirashafri as applied to claims 17 and 19 above, and further in view of Chiles et

al., U.S. Patent No. 6,167,567.

44.   As to claims 18 and 20, Mirashafri teaches the invention as claimed with respect

to claims 17 and 19. However, Mirashafri fails to teach updating the technical-support-

information previously downloaded from the technical-support-source.

45.   Chiles teaches updating software previously downloaded from a software source

(col. 3, lines 29 – 31.)

46.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Chiles with Mirashafri because Chiles'

updating enhances the method's functionality by providing the most up-to-date

information available (Chiles, lines 18 – 24.)

47.   Claims 21 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Mirashafri in view of Ogdon.

48.   As to claim 21, Mirashafri teaches generating a handle at a first user location

wherein the handle comprises information relating to content (col. 4, lines 9 - 10);

transmitting the handle from the first user location to a second user location through the

network (col. 4, lines 21 - 25); accessing the handle at the second user location to

determine the location of the content (col. 4, lines 28 – 29), wherein the rendering is

controlled by the handle (col. 4, lines 28 – 31.) However, Mirashafri does not teach that

if the content is present at the second user location, rendering the content for a user at

the second user location; and if the content is not present at the second user location,

locating and rendering the content for the user at the second user location.

49.　　Ogdon teaches that if the content is present at the second user location,

rendering the content for a user at the second user location; and if the content is not

present at the second user location, locating and rendering the content for the user at

the second user location (col. 22, lines 1 – 4, 15 – 17.)

50.　　It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Ogdon with Mirashafri because

Ogdon's steps increase efficiency by minimizing the amount of time wasted locating

remotely stored content that is already locally stored.

51.　　As to claim 22, the combination of Mirashafri and Ogdon teach delivering the

content prior to the rendering step if the content is not present at the user location

(Ogdon, col. 22, lines 21 – 23.)

52.　　As to claim 23, the combination of Mirashafri and Ogdon teach generating a

synch handle comprising temporal information related to content (Ogdon, col. 18, lines

40 – 44); transmitting the synch handle to a second user location (col. 20, lines 51 –

52); rendering the content at the first user location (Mirashafri, col. 4, lines 20 – 21); and synchronizing the rendering at the second user location with the rendering of the content at the first user location in accordance with the synch handle (Ogdon, Fig. 2D, reference character 552.)

53.   As to claim 24, the combination of Mirashafri and Ogdon teach that the synch handle is transmitted with the handle (Ogdon, col. 20, lines 51 – 52.)

54.   As to claim 25, the combination of Mirashafri and Ogdon teach requesting, by the user, transmission of the synch handle (Ogdon, col. 21, lines 24 – 29.)

Response to Arguments

55.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zarni Maung whose telephone number is (703) 308-6687. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as

follows:

Official Faxes:	(703) 872-9306
After Final Responses:	(703) 746-7238
Draft Responses:	(703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-3900.

September 17, 2003

ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER